

Serial Number: 10/709,364
Filed: 4/29/2004

babcock ip

Remarks

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-9, 14-21 and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by *Haller*. The male portion of *Haller* has a second outer contact 41 sleeve (identified by the Examiner as the "first spring") formed in a "c" shape that presses axially against the forward end of a female portion helical spring "second contact 16", compressing the spring axially to form a secure contact as the connector portions are mated together (col. 2 ln 42-52). The lower ends 50, 51 of the second outer contact 41 sleeve mate within axial slits 78 of the first body for radial support, preventing radial deformation of the second outer contact 41 to ensure it presses axially against the forward end of the second contact 16, even if the connector bodies are rotated with respect to each other (col. 4 ln 4-22).

The first spring according to the present novel and non-obvious invention is dimensioned to be compressed between the sleeve and the inner diameter surface of the male connector body to create an additional mechanical and electrical connection between the female connector body and the male connector body (Spec. para. 31). Independent Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation that the first spring is compressed between the inner diameter surface and the outer diameter of the sleeve. Independent Claim 18 includes the limitation that the first spring is adapted to engage the inner diameter surface. Independent Claim 26 includes the limitation that the spring ring has a plurality of deflectable protrusions extending outward from the collar to contact the inner diameter surface.

As specifically cited from the *Haller* description, herein above, the *Haller* "first spring" only contacts the second contact 16, axially, not the inner diameter surface. The "first spring" is insulated from the inner diameter surface by passage through the axial slits 78 of the housing 36 (see *Haller*, figures 7 and 9). Because the "first spring" identified by the Examiner in *Haller* does

Serial Number: 10/709,364
Filed: 4/29/2004

BARBECOOK IP

not contact the inner diameter surface, whatsoever, rejection of claims 1-3, 5-9, 14-21 and 26-29 under 35 USC 102(b) is improper.

Further with respect to independent claims 5, 8 and 26, the *Haller* "first spring" identified by the Examiner is not a spring ring at all, but a "c" shaped bent metal contact (see *Haller*, figure 8A). Claim 26 has been amended to further clarify that the claimed spring ring has a cylindrical collar. Because the "collar" identified by the Examiner in *Haller* fails to have a cylindrical aspect, and is in fact not a ring, at all, rejection of claims 5, 8 and 26-29 under 35 USC 102(b) is improper.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-4, 9, 14 and 16-17 under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by *Hall*. In *Hall*, the "first spring" 33 identified by the Examiner is an axial compression element, fully enclosed at the cable end of the connector and isolated from the male/female connection interface (see *Hall*, figure 3). Therefore, the "first spring" 33 does not contact either the sleeve 25 or the inner diameter surface. Because the "first spring" 33 identified by the Examiner in *Hall* does not contact the inner diameter surface, whatsoever, each and every element of the claimed invention fails to appear in the cited reference. Therefore, rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 9, 14, and 16-17 under 35 USC 102(e) is improper.

Further with respect to claim 4, as plainly shown in *Hall* figure 3, *Hall* does not include a canted coil spring. *Hall* discloses only a conventional helical spring. One skilled in the art will understand that a canted coil spring, for example as shown in Applicant's specification figures 7 and 8, is a spring in which a tubular spring coil is formed into a ring by joining the ends to each other. Because the spring identified by the Examiner in *Hall* is not a canted coil spring, each and every element of the claimed invention fails to appear in the cited reference. Therefore, rejection of claim 4 under 35 USC 102(e) is improper.

Serial Number: 10/709,364
Filed: 4/29/2004

BARCOCK IP

The Examiner rejected claims 10-11, 22 and 24-25 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over *Haller* in view of *Maury*. The Examiner admits that *Haller* does not disclose a second groove, a second spring or the female connector being one of an SMA and a Type N connector and supplies *Maury* therefore. Because the Examiner relies upon *Haller* for each of the remaining claim elements, each and every element fails to be disclosed, taught or suggested. As described in detail herein above with respect to the Examiner's 35 USC 102(b) rejections of the independent claim(s) from which claims 10-11, 22 and 24-25 depend, *Haller* fails to disclose at least the claimed limitation of the first spring contacting the inner diameter surface. Therefore, rejection of claims 10-11, 22 and 24-25 under 35 USC 103(a) is improper.

The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over *Hall* in view of *Maury*. The Examiner admits that *Hall* does not disclose the female connector being one of an SMA and a Type N connector and supplies *Maury* therefore. Because the Examiner relies upon *Hall* for each of the remaining claim elements, each and every element fails to be disclosed, taught or suggested. As described in detail herein above with respect to the Examiner's 35 USC 102(e) rejections of the independent claim 1 from which claim 11 depends, *Hall* fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least the claimed limitation of the first spring contacting the inner diameter surface. Therefore, rejection of claim 11 under 35 USC 103(a) is improper.

The Examiner rejected claims 12-13 and 23 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over *Haller*. The Examiner admits that *Haller* does not disclose a third groove according to the invention and suggests that the addition of this element would be obvious. Because the Examiner relies upon *Haller* for each of the remaining claim elements, each and every element fails to be disclosed, taught or suggested. As described in detail herein above with respect to the Examiner's 35 USC 102(b) rejections of the independent claim(s) from which claims 12-13 and 23 depend, *Haller* fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least the claimed limitation of the first spring contacting the inner diameter surface. Therefore, rejection of claims 12-13 and 23 under 35 USC 103(a) is improper.


Serial Number: 10/709,364
Filed: 4/29/2004

BABCOCK IP

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over *Hall*. The Examiner admits that *Hall* does not disclose a third groove according to the invention and suggests that the addition of this element would be obvious. Because the Examiner relies upon *Hall* for each of the remaining claim elements, each and every element fails to be disclosed, taught or suggested. As described in detail herein above with respect to the Examiner's 35 USC 102(e) rejections of the independent claim 1 from which claims 12 and 13 depend, *Hall* fails to disclose at least the claimed limitation of the first spring contacting the inner diameter surface. Therefore, rejection of claims 12-13 and 23 under 35 USC 103(a) is improper.

Having obviated each of the Examiners rejections, applicant respectfully requests that a notice of allowance be issued. Should the Examiner be inclined to issue an Official Action other than the notice of allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner first contact Applicant by telephone at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,




Andrew Babcock, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number 44517

Babcock IP, LLC
24154 Lakeside Dr.
Lake Zurich, IL 60047
Telephone: 847 719-2063
Fax: 847 438-5743

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No 571 273-8300) on April 6, 2005.



Andrew D. Babcock